

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/729,324	Applicant(s) VAN BRUGGEN, BERT	
	Examiner James N. Smalley	Art Unit 3727	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) James N. Smalley. (3) David D. Dwell
 (2) Nathan Newhouse (4) _____

Date of Interview: March 2, 2006

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____. Applicant presented the invention.

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed: Kline US 6,360,908 ; Magnusson US 4,227,619
Crisci US 4,230,229.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

~~1) Proposed amendment to claims 1, 8 and 14 applied~~
~~2) Proposed amendment to claims 1, 8 and 14 applied~~

1) Proposed amendments to claims 1, 8 and 14 define over the applied prior art.


NATHAN J. NEWHOUSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

1. (currently amended) A drum closure overcap for application over a primary dispensing closure on industrial size containers comprising [a] an integrally molded plastic cap having a disc like top wall surrounded by a depending skirt terminating in a first free edge, an annular locking bead formed on the interior of said cap skirt, a circumferentially enlarged tamper detecting band surrounding a major exterior surface portion of ^{the height} said cap skirt terminating in a second lowermost free edge, said band radially spaced from said skirt and connected thereto at spaced intervals by radially extending frangible connecting webs, a tear strip formed in said cap defined by a pair of weakened score lines extending upwardly across said cap skirt and laterally into said top wall, said tamper detecting band in one area integrally connected to said cap skirt adjacent the skirt end of said tear strip and radially protruding gripping means on said band disposed diametrically opposite said tear strip to enable separation of said frangible connecting webs so that the band can be subsequently grasped for destructive removal of said cap by tearing said strip along said score lines across said skirt and into said top wall and said score lines in said top wall terminating spaced from said gripping means.

2. (original) A drum closure overcap as in claim 1 and said frangible connecting webs interrupted in the area of said band connection.

3. (original) A drum closure overcap as in claim 1 and said connecting webs configured to rupture adjacent said band leaving the torn vestige on said skirt.

4. (previously presented) A drum closure overcap as in claim 1 and said connection between said skirt and said band extending axially away from said first free edge.

Interview for Draft

5. (cancelled)

6. (cancelled)

7. (original) A drum closure overcap as in claim 1 wherein said first and second free edges are substantially coplanar.

8. (currently amended) In combination, a manually applied overcap and a container dispensing closure comprising a laterally extending container wall, an internally threaded upstanding neck formed in said wall, said neck terminating in a circumferentially enlarged outward curl, an integrally molded plastic cap fitted on said neck, said cap having a disc like top wall surrounded by a depending skirt terminating in a first free edge lying in close surface to surface proximity to said container wall, an annular locking bead formed on the interior of said cap skirt in engagement with said neck curl, a circumferentially enlarged tamper detecting band surrounding a major exterior surface portion of ^{the height} said cap skirt terminating in a second lowermost free edge, frangible interconnecting means between said band and skirt, a tear strip formed in said cap extending upwardly across said cap skirt and laterally into said top, said band integrally connected to said tear strip and said tamper detecting band including gripping means to enable separation of said band so the band can be grasped for destructive removal of said cap from container neck by tearing said strip along said score lines out of said cap and exposing said dispensing closure.

9.(original) The combination as in claim 8 wherein said first and second free edges are substantially coplanar.

10. (previously presented) The combination as in claim 8 and said skirt free edge lying in direct contact with said container wall.

11-13 (cancelled)

14. (currently amended) In combination, a manually applied overcap and a container dispensing closure comprising a container wall, an internally threaded upstanding neck formed in said wall, said neck terminating in a circumferential enlargement, an integrally molded plastic cap fitted on said neck, said cap having a disc like top wall surrounded by a depending skirt terminating in a first free edge lying in close proximity to said upstanding neck, internal closure locking means formed on said overcap, a circumferentially enlarged tamper detecting band surrounding a major exterior portion of ^{the height} said cap skirt terminating in a second lowermost free edge, a series of frangible interconnecting webs between said band and skirt, a tear strip formed in said cap defined by a pair of weakened score lines extending upwardly across said cap skirt and laterally at least partially across said cap top, said tamper detecting band in one area integrally connected to said cap skirt adjacent the skirt end of said tear strip and circumferentially narrow finger gripping means protruding radially from said band to enable separation of said band from said skirt by rupturing said interconnecting webs so the band can be hand grasped for destructive removal of said cap from said container neck by tearing said strip along said score lines across said skirt and into said top wall exposing said dispensing closure.

15. (previously presented) The combination as in claim 14 and said score lines extending across a major portion of said cap top.